DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 600 CS 507 878

AUTHOR Klein, Jeanne
TITLE A Developmental Comparison of Perceived Reality in Live Theatre.
PUB DATE 20 Mar 92
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Southwestern Society for Research in Human Development (8th, Tempe, AZ, March 20-21, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Age Differences; Audience Awareness; *Audience Response; *Cognitive Development; College Students; Comparative Analysis; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; Higher Education; *Student Reaction; *Theater Arts
IDENTIFIERS Perceived Reality

ABSTRACT

A study explored perceived reality and developmental differences in viewing theater. Subjects, 33 second graders, 33 fourth graders, 23 sixth graders, and 23 college students viewed a production of "This Is Not a Pipe Dream," a non-representational play based on biographical facts about the early life and work of the surrealist painter Rene Magritte. Children were interviewed one day after theater attendance, and the college students completed an analogous written questionnaire. This open-ended, inductive method resulted in the generation and emergence of six symbol systems or theater conventions and categories of cues which resulted from asking "How do you know?" Results indicated that: (1) while focused primarily on production values, children increasingly judge a playwright's script for its social believability; (2) second graders relied on visual cues to judge actuality or authenticity; (3) fourth graders began a developmental shift in applying outside knowledge to scrutinize possibility; (4) sixth graders considered plausibility; and (5) college students suspended their disbelief by judging the context of media genres. Findings suggest that theater artists need to make production styles more explicit so that metaphoric themes become more recognizably visible and audible to predominantly novice audiences; and children and adults alike could benefit most from a theater education to better grasp theater's multi-layered symbol systems. (A schematic system of symbols in theater, a list of questions about the reality of the play, symbol systems of perceived reality, cue categories used to judge reality, and four tables of data are included; 17 references are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED347600

A DEVELOPMENTAL COMPARISON OF PERCEIVED REALITY IN LIVE THEATRE

Jeanne Klein
Associate Professor

Department of Theatre & Film
University of Kansas
317 Murphy
Lawrence, KS 66045
(913) 864-4110
Bitnet: KleinJ@UKANVAX

A paper presented at the Eighth Biennial Meeting of the Southwestern Society for Research in Human Development, Tempe, AZ, March 20, 1992.

CS507878

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jeanne Klein
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Theatre creates a symbolic illusion of reality with actors performing a fictive play for audiences who suspend their disbelief willingly within a given theatrical context (see Table 1). This symbol system involves various levels of perceived reality which operate simultaneously during viewing. Physical stage reality presents live actors, lit against scenery on a stage, speaking and performing actions with voices and bodies, wearing costumes, using props, and hearing sounds in an auditorium. From these concrete, visual and aural cues, audiences interpret and reflect upon the theme of a fictive story where characters enact various events in time and space as metaphoric representations of the human condition. On another level, directors, actors, and designers employ various production styles or metaphoric forms to express the playwright's textual content. For example, Realism, as defined in theatre, seeks to imitate or reproduce real life as an illusion, while Expressionism recreates and constructs the main character's perspective. In the latter case, audiences are expected to perceive and judge a performance from inside the character's perception of environmental reality in order to empathize with the character's "felt life" in more powerful ways.

How do young audiences perceive, interpret, and judge these concrete and abstract levels of reality in theatre? Which theatrical symbols or conventions are most salient to different age groups? What perceptual cues do they use to distinguish between factual and fictional content and realistic and non-realistic forms in theatre?

According to Gardner's theoretical framework of intelligence (1983, 1988), children develop an understanding of symbol systems in "streams, waves, and channels." Artistic skills of perception, reflection, and critical judgment follow separate developmental paths in visual art and music (Parsons, 1987; Hargreaves, 1986), but a developmental theory of perceptual skills in theatre remains to be tested in descriptive studies (Davis & Evans, 1987, 59-71). We do know that preschoolers play characters, structure dramatic events, and create scenic environments from found objects much like adult actors, playwrights, designers, and directors who juxtapose fantasy and reality freely. However, school-age children enter a stage of literal realism where they learn to master the technical rules and crafts of academic domains. Because theatre is not valued highly in education and society, few children (and adults) study theatre's symbol systems formally, though their years of dramatic play and avid television viewing may cultivate and increase their preferences for social realism (Gerbner, et al., 1986).

Method

To explore perceived reality and developmental differences in viewing theatre, 33 second graders, 33 fourth graders, 23 sixth graders, and 23 adults viewed a production of <u>This Is Not a Pipe Dream</u> (Kornhauser, 1987) (among an audience of 600). This 48-minute, non-representational play is based on biographical facts about the early life and work of surrealist painter, René Magritte. Its non-linear plot jumps between and within scenes

among three states of "reality"--the Stage World, Magritte's Biographical World, and René's Dream World. The Stage Manager, visible on stage, keeps us aware that this is a play--not the illusion of real life. The Narrator serves as René's dream conscience, while she and the ensemble demonstrate how theatre is like painting as a metatheatrical framework around René's story (Klein, 1991).

Measures

Children were interviewed individually one day after theatre attendance, and adults completed an analogous written questionnaire (see Table 2). Subjects were asked to describe any aspects of the play which were: 1) "make-believe" or "not real," 2) "actually real," 3) "realistic" or "seemed like it was real," and 4) "facts" about the main character; and how they knew these realities. They were also asked to explain what the Narrator meant when she said that "a play is not real life."

This open-ended, inductive method resulted in the generation and emergence of six symbol systems or theatre conventions which were divided into two main dimensions (see Table 3): Theatrical production values included 1) acting (e.g., actors playing characters) and 2) spectacle (e.g., authentic and fake props). Dramatic script values involved 3) fictive play (i.e., characters' fictive actions created by the playwright), 4) factual story (i.e., enacted biographical facts about Magritte), 5) fantasy (i.e., Mother's ghost and indications that the respondent watched the play from René's dream perspective),

and 6) the protagonist's superobjective or goal of becoming an artist, which also formed the basis of the play's theme. (The latter convention was separated for analysis because it could be considered both fiction and fact.)

The same method was employed to generate categories of cues which resulted from asking "How do you know?" (see Table 4). Judgments made from inside the production's confines included explicit visual and verbal/aural cues, and implicit psychological cues inferred from characters' thoughts. Knowledge applied from outside the confines of the production was defined as social realism (i.e., possible and impossible knowledge about people), theatre context (e.g., regarding theatre or plays), general knowledge (i.e., about objects or Magritte), personal experience, and explicitly stated training from teachers.

Each discrete category for both coding systems was scored once when a subject used that category. Interrater reliability ranged from 91% to 99%.

Results

Interpretations of reality terms varied considerably. For example, the same character action or prop was considered both "make-believe" and "actually real" depending on individual perceptions. Therefore, to determine how each age group perceived and judged reality in the production and script, responses to the first three questions about "make-believe," "actually real," and "realistic" aspects in the play were combined. "Fact" responses about Magritte were analyzed

separately because this question was limited to the content of the script and not related to production values. Oneway ANOVAs by grade (4) revealed significant age differences in what and how audiences perceived reality in this play (see Table 5 & 8).

Production values were distributed among all age groups, and there was little variance within discrete symbol systems. However, script values increased in importance for children as 4th and 6th graders focused more on the story than 2nd graders, $F(3,108) = 5.51$, $p < .01$. While 2nd graders attended to more cues inside the production than outside, older groups judged the play's realism more from their outside knowledge, $F(3,108) = 9.10$, $p < .001$. Fourth graders differed most from older viewers in attending to inside production cues, $F(3,108) = 5.72$, $p < .001$.

A closer look at how each age group perceived inside production cues and applied outside knowledge reveals how each judged the reality of symbol systems in significantly different ways. Second graders focused more on production than script values by attending to more inside than outside production cues. More than adults, for example, 2nd graders used more visual cues, $F(3,108) = 4.55$, $p < .01$, to discern the authenticity of props, $F(3,108) = 3.24$, $p < .05$. Fourth graders, like second graders, also focused more on production than script values, but they relied more evenly on both inside cues and outside knowledge. They used more visual cues, $F(3,108) = 4.55$, $p < .01$, and made more inferences about characters' thoughts, $F(3,108) = 3.31$, $p < .05$, than older viewers, while pointing out more socially

unrealistic or impossible actions, $F(3,108) = 6.97$, $p < .001$ than 2nd graders or adults. Unlike 2nd graders, 6th graders focused more evenly on both production and script values, while applying more outside than inside knowledge. They reflected most on the protagonist's objective to become an artist more than adults, $F(3,108) = 2.81$, $p < .05$, and they noted more socially possible and impossible actions than the youngest and oldest viewers, $F(3,108) = 5.48$, $p < .01$. Adults focused on more production than script values like 2nd and 4th graders, but they relied on more outside knowledge like 6th graders. In particular, adults judged the reality of the whole play by calling attention to the theatre context more than children, [respectively $F(3,108) = 9.17$, $p < .0001$; 7.00, $p < .001$.] Unlike 4th and 6th graders, they were less concerned about socially unrealistic actions, $F(3,108) = 6.97$, $p < .001$, an unbelievable ghost, $F(3,108) = 3.11$, $p < .05$, or factual information about Magritte's story, $F(3,108) = 6.67$, $p < .001$.

These results may be explained, in part, by how audiences evaluated the "factual" content of the script (see Table 6). Respondents' pre-performance training may have influenced their reports of "facts about Magritte." Second graders received no pre-performance training whatsoever, and one-third did not know the meaning of "fact," $F(3,108) = 10.46$, $p < .0001$. Thirty-five percent of the 4th and 6th graders combined received information about Magritte from their elementary art teachers. College

students heard lectures on Magritte and the play from their instructor for an introductory theatre course.

Despite this training, 43% of the respondents interpreted fictional aspects of the playwright's script as biographical facts. For example, though little is known about Magritte's father, over half of these respondents (24%) perceived that René's Father did not want his son to become an artist as a biographical fact. As 4th and 6th graders stated, "they wouldn't play [these facts] if they weren't real facts . . . because then it wouldn't be this true story;" and "I don't think they'd have a lie in this play." Adults assumed that, "there was some historical basis to the play," and that "the text [was] true to his life." Older viewers restated René's objective as a fact more than 2nd graders, $F(3,108) = 8.04$, $p<.001$; while adults reported more accurate facts than children, $F(3,108) = 16.62$, $p<.001$.

Though respondents had been relying primarily on visual cues to judge earlier perceived realities, they now used more verbal than visual cues to determine factual information, though 2nd graders used both sets of explicit perceptual cues in equal proportions. As one 4th grader noted, "plays probably wouldn't say things that weren't really true," while an adult added that, "the narrator seemed to give [these facts] legitimacy." The implications from these findings raise ethical questions for playwrights in creating biographical texts for young audiences.

When combining all cues used to judge the four reality terms, visual cues accounted for 33% of the total responses, verbal cues 21%, and social realism 14%. Those who relied on visual cues also tended to use verbal cues ($r = .29$, $p<.001$), and those who used verbal cues were more likely to infer characters' implied thoughts (5%) ($r = .25$, $p<.01$). These findings support the visual superiority theory in both theatre and television studies because action is the foundation of drama (Klein, 1987; Klein & Fitch, 1989, 1990; Gibbons, et al., 1986). The more young audiences watch dramatic actions in a play, the more they listen to dialogue; which, in turn, induces more inference-making from within characters' perspectives.

Finally, when asked what the Narrator meant when she said a play is not real life (see Table 7), over one-third of the responses involved acting conventions; that is, though actors are real live people, they play characters and perform rehearsed and sometimes unrealistic actions. As one 4th grader noted, "When it's life, they use more expression, they tell you more; and when it's not true, they use more acting than talking." Sixth graders focused on acting more than other groups, $F(3,108) = 5.63$, $p<.001$. Adults tended to explain how a play is fiction and therefore not true, $F(3,108) = 2.77$, $p<.05$, while children used other conventions as specific examples to support their reasoning.

Discussion

In summary, this study confirms the findings of other narrative and television studies (Landry, Kelly, & Gardner, 1982; Dorr, 1983). While focused primarily on production values, children increasingly judge a playwright's script for its social believability. When viewing theatre, 2nd graders rely on visual cues to judge actuality or authenticity, 4th graders begin a developmental shift in applying outside knowledge to scrutinize possibility, 6th graders consider plausibility, and adults suspend their disbelief by judging the context of media genres.

Though some respondents received pre-performance training, none could be considered "experts" in theatre's symbol systems. All respondents were "novice" theatre audiences (rather than dramatic players) relying on outside knowledge and perceptual visual and verbal cues, rather than interpreting more expressionistic cues and imagining the protagonist's psychic reality (Gardner, 1992; 1991, 177-78). In fact, only 13% of the respondents reported perceiving the play from inside René's "surrealistic" dream perspective, as intended by the production's artists. Admittedly, asking "How do you know?" is an empirical question which may force more visual and verbal responses. However, the overall implication of this study is two-fold: 1) Theatre artists, playwrights in particular, need to make production styles more explicit so that metaphoric themes become more recognizably visible and audible to predominately novice audiences; and, 2) children and adults alike could benefit most

from a theatre education to better grasp theatre's multi-layered symbol systems. Theatre, by definition, is an "illusory lie," and attempts to clarify theatrical Realism could make audiences less gullible to the tricks of this trade.

Future studies can build upon this exploratory research with other local audiences and productions employing various stylistic designs. Open-ended questioning methods provide rich qualitative narratives to evaluate productions and to dispel myths about young audiences' discriminations between fantasy and reality in live theatre. March is Theatre in Our Schools month. What better time to broaden and develop young audiences' perceptions of the richly textured realities of theatre?

Acknowledgments

Special thanks to Marguerite Fitch and Lisa Reboy, doctoral students in KU's Department of Human Development, for statistical advice in reporting the results of this study.

References

Davis, J. H., & Evans, M. J. (1987). Theatre, children and youth. New Orleans: Anchorage.

Dorr, A. (1983). No shortcuts to judging reality. In J. Bryant & D. R. Anderson (Eds.), Children's understanding of television: Research on attention and comprehension (pp. 199-220). New York: Academic Press.

Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1988). Toward more effective arts education. In H. Gardner & D. N. Perkins (Eds.), Art, mind, and education: Research from Project Zero (pp. 157-167). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Gardner, H. (1991). The unschooled mind. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. Personal communication, February 29, 1992.

Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., & Signorielli, N. (1986). Living with television: The dynamics of the cultivation process. In J. Bryant & D. Zillman (Eds.), Perspectives in media effects. (pp. 17-40). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gibbons, J., Anderson, D. R., Smith, R., Field, D. A., & Fischer, C. (1986). Young children's recall and reconstruction of audio and audiovisual narratives. Child Development, 57, 1014-1023.

Hargreaves, D. J. (1986). The developmental psychology of music. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Klein, J. (1987). Children's processing of theatre as a function of verbal and visual recall. Youth Theatre Journal, 2(1), 9-13.

Klein, J. (1991, May). Illusion, reality, and virtual destiny: A performance text analysis of This is Not a Pipe Dream. Paper presented at a drama symposium at Arizona State University, Tempe.

Klein, J., & Fitch, M. (1989). Third grade children's verbal and visual recall of Monkey, Monkey. Youth Theatre Journal, 4(2), 9-15.

Klein, J., & Fitch, M. (1990). First grade children's comprehension of Noodle Doodle Box. Youth Theatre Journal, 5(2), 7-13.

Kornhauser, B. (1987). This Is Not a Pipe Dream. Unpublished manuscript. Lancaster, PA: Fulton Opera House.

Landry, M. O., Kelly, H., & Gardner, H. (1982). Reality-fantasy discriminations in literature: A developmental study. Research in the Teaching of English 16(1), 39-52.

Parsons, M. J. (1987). How we understand art. New York: Cambridge University Press.

This is Not a Pipe Dream. (1990, September). Directed by J. Klein. Lawrence: University of Kansas Theatre for Young People.

Table 1

A Schematic System of Symbols in Theatre

Theatre Reality	Audience Perception
Auditorium live audience	A Theatrical Event
Physical Stage	Perception of Concrete Production Forms
live actors voices speaking bodies moving	
scenery	
costumes	
props	
lights	
sound	
special effects	
Fictive Play	Reflection of Abstract Script Content
plot/story	
theme/metaphoric idea	
characters objectives/goals dialogue actions	
setting/space/time	
Production Style	Judgment of Believability Connecting Form and Content
e.g. Realism (illusion of real life)	
e.g. Expressionism (expresses character viewpoint)	

Table 2

Questions about the Reality of the Play

1. What was "MAKE-BELIEVE" or "not real" in the play?
   How do you know (it) was "make-believe"?

2. What was "ACTUALLY REAL" in the play?
   How do you know (it) was "actually real"?

3. What was "REALISTIC" or "seemed like it was real" in the play?
   How do you know (it) was "realistic"?

4. What were some "FACTS ABOUT RENÉ MAGRITTE" in the play?
   How do you know those were facts about him/his life?

5. What did [the Narrator] mean when she said that A PLAY IS NOT REAL LIFE?

Table 3

Symbol Systems of Perceived Reality

PRODUCTION

ACTING	SPECTACLE
Live Actors	Scenery
Acting	Authentic Props
Metatheatrical Actions	Fake Props
	Costumes
	Sound/Lighting/Special effects

SCRIPT

FICTIVE PLAY	FACTUAL STORY
René's (fictive) Childhood	René's (biographical) Childhood
René's (fictive) Actions/Traits	René's (biographical) Traits
René and Georgette scene	René married Georgette
Father's Objective	Mother Died (committed suicide)
Other Character Actions	
Whole Play	

FANTASY	RENÉ'S OBJECTIVE (both fact and fiction)
Mother's Ghost	To become an artist
René's "Surrealistic" Dreams	

Table 4

Cue Categories Used to Judge Reality ("How do you know"?)

INSIDE PRODUCTION

VISUAL CUES	VERBAL/AURAL Cues
René's actions	René's dialogue
Others' actions	Others' dialogue
"They showed"	"They told" (primarily the Narrator)
Appearances seen	Sounds heard

PSYCHOLOGICAL INFERENCES

René's thoughts

Others' thoughts

OUTSIDE PRODUCTION KNOWLEDGE

SOCIAL REALISM (possible and impossible knowledge about people)

THEATRE CONTEXT (knowledge about theatre and plays in general)

GENERAL KNOWLEDGE (about objects or Magritte)

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE (relates incidents from personal life)

TRAINING (explicitly states knowledge from art teacher or instructor)

Table 5

Means for Symbol Systems and Cues by Age Group

("Make-Believe," "Actually Real," and "Realistic" Questions Combined)

	2nd		4th		6th		Adult				
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	X	SD	F(3,108)
PRODUCTION	.11	.09	.14	.10	.11	.08	.12	.06	.12	.08	
Acting	.13	.10	.15	.12	.10	.11	.14	.10	.13	.10	
Perform Char	.01	.06	.10	.20	.10	.16	.13	.19	.08	.16	3.27*
Spectacle	.11	.11	.14	.12	.12	.11	.10	.09	.12	.11	
Auth Props	.18	.25	.09	.17	.10	.16	.03	.10	.11	.19	3.24*
Sound/Light	.05	.15	.18	.27	.07	.17	.28	.29	.14	.24	6.04***
SCRIPT	.04	.04	.08	.05	.10	.06	.06	.05	.07	.05	5.51**
R Objective	.09	.20	.09	.20	.20	.29	.02	.10	.10	.21	2.81*
Fictive Play	.03	.05	.07	.06	.06	.06	.09	.08	.06	.06	3.92**
Whole Play	.03	.10	.06	.18	.03	.10	.25	.27	.08	.19	9.17****
Factual Story			.06	.13	.10	.12	.01	.04	.04	.10	6.67***
Fantasy	.08	.11	.10	.11	.14	.13	.06	.11	.10	.12	
Ghost	.18	.24	.23	.25	.26	.26	.07	.17	.19	.24	3.11*
INSIDE PROD	.08	.06	.10	.08	.05	.04	.04	.05	.07	.07	5.72***
Visual Cues	.12	.11	.15	.14	.08	.08	.05	.07	.11	.12	4.55**
Verbal Cues	.05	.06	.06	.08	.03	.05	.04	.06	.05	.07	
Psych Infer	.03	.09	.07	.13	.01	.04			.03	.09	3.31*
OUTSIDE PROD	.04	.05	.11	.07	.11	.08	.12	.07	.09	.07	9.10***
Social Realism	.07	.12	.14	.14	.20	.16	.07	.12	.12	.14	5.48**
Possible	.03	.12	.05	.15	.24	.30	.15	.24	.10	.21	6.40***
Impossible	.10	.16	.20	.20	.17	.17	.02	.07	.13	.18	6.97***
Th Context	.02	.08	.11	.18	.09	.18	.23	.23	.10	.18	7.00***

*p <.05 **p <.01 ***p <.001 ****p <.0001

[Oneway ANOVAs using Student-Newman-Keuls test significant at .05 level.]

Table 6a "What are Facts about Magritte?"

Means for "Facts about Magritte" by Age Group

	2nd M	2nd SD	4th M	4th SD	6th M	6th SD	Adult M	Adult SD	X	SD	F(3,108)
(Didn't Know)	.33	.48	.03	.17					.11	.31	10.46****
RENÉ OBJECTIVE	.33	.48	.79	.42	.83	.39	.70	.47	.64	.48	8.04***
Mother died			.24	.44	.35	.49	.61	.50	.27	.45	11.19***
R married G	.03	.17	.18	.39	.17	.39	.30	.47	.16	.37	2.70*
R childhood			.18	.39	.09	.29	.13	.34	.10	.30	
R bio traits							.22	.42	.05	.21	7.95****
FACTUAL STORY	.01	.04	.15	.17	.15	.20	.32	.22	.14	.19	16.62****
F objective	.06	.24	.30	.47	.30	.47	.35	.49	.24	.43	2.96*
R acts/traits	.24	.44	.21	.42	.30	.47	.04	.21	.21	.41	
R childhood			.12	.33	.04	.21	.04	.21	.05	.23	
Char actions	.06	.24			.04	.21			.03	.16	
Whole play	.03	.17							<.01	.10	
FICTIVE PLAY	.08	.12	.13	.12	.14	.13	.09	.13	.11	.13	

Table 6b "How do you know?"

Means for Each Cue Used to Judge "Facts" by Age Group

	2nd M	2nd SD	4th M	4th SD	6th M	6th SD	Adult M	Adult SD	X	SD	F(3,108)
TH CONTEXT	.03	.17	.15	.36	.04	.21	.26	.45	.12	.32	3.01*
TRAINING (stated)			.15	.36	.17	.39	.17	.39	.12	.32	
VERBAL/AURAL	.05	.10	.11	.17	.14	.18	.11	.13	.10	.15	
GEN KNOWLEDGE	.03	.17	.03	.17	.17	.39	.09	.29	.07	.26	
SOCIAL REALISM			.12	.36	.13	.34			.06	.24	
VISUAL	.05	.10	.08	.15	.05	.11	.02	.07	.06	.12	

*p <.05 **p <.01 ***p <.001 ****p<.0001

[Note: Inappropriate 2nd and 6th grade responses for acting, spectacle, and fantasy categories are not included. Total means less than .05 are not reported. Oneway ANOVAs using Student-Newman-Keuls test significant at .05 level.]

Table 7

Means of Symbol Systems Used to Explain Why Play is not Real Life

	2nd M	2nd SD	4th M	4th SD	6th M	6th SD	Adult M	Adult SD	X	SD	F(3,108)
SCRIPT	.17	.17	.15	.18	.15	.16	.20	.13	.17	.16	
FICTIVE PLAY	.33	.48	.30	.47	.39	.50	.65	.49	.40	.49	2.77*
SOCIAL REALISM	.21	.42	.21	.42	.17	.39	.13	.34	.19	.39	
FANTASY	.06	.21	.05	.19	.02	.10			.04	.16	
Ghost	.09	.29	.06	.24	.04	.21			.05	.23	
Dreams	.03	.17	.03	.17					.02	.13	
PRODUCTION	.11	.13	.16	.14	.20	.12	.10	.13	.14	.14	3.20*
ACTING	.12	.16	.18	.17	.29	.18	.12	.16	.17	.18	5.63***
Perform Char	.21	.42	.30	.47	.61	.50	.30	.47	.34	.48	3.59*
Metatheatre	.12	.33	.06	.24	.22	.42			.10	.30	
Live actors	.03	.17	.18	.39	.04	.21	.04	.21	.08	.27	
SPECTACLE	.11	.21	.14	.26	.07	.17	.07	.23	.10	.22	
Fake props	.12	.33	.24	.44	.04	.21	.09	.29	.13	.34	
Set/Costumes	.09	.29	.03	.17	.09	.29	.04	.21	.06	.24	
(Don't Know)	.09	.29	.09	.29	.09	.29	.09	.29	.09	.29	

*p<.05 ***p<.001

[Note: Respondents were not asked "How do you know?" Oneway ANOVAs using Student-Newman-Keuls test significant at .05 level.]

Table 8

Significant Mean Age Differences for Symbol Systems and Cues

	2nd		4th		6th		Adult				
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	X	SD	F(3,108)
MAKE-BELIEVE											
SCRIPT	.08	.13	.12	.12	.14	.10	.08	.10	.11	.11	
Ghost	.33	.48	.42	.50	.52	.51	.13	.34	.36	.48	2.99*
Whole Play	.03	.17	.06	.24			.35	.49	.11	.30	8.27****
PRODUCTION	.13	.12	.19	.15	.14	.16	.19	.13	.16	.14	
Scenery	.09	.29	.36	.49	.22	.42	.09	.29	.20	.40	3.52*
Sound/Lights	.03	.17	.15	.36	.13	.34	.44	.51	.17	.38	6.16***
IN CUES	.12	.12	.13	.13	.05	.08	.06	.07	.10	.11	4.22**
Visual	.19	.17	.20	.22	.10	.15	.08	.14	.15	.18	3.76**
Appearances	.52	.51	.39	.50	.30	.47	.17	.39	.37	.48	2.51*
OUT KNOWLEDGE	.06	.09	.18	.16	.18	.17	.12	.10	.13	.14	5.71***
Soc Realism	.27	.45	.55	.51	.52	.51	.04	.21	.36	.48	7.21***
Th Context			.12	.33	.13	.34	.30	.47	.13	.33	4.12**
Gen Knowledge			.12	.33	.22	.42	.09	.29	.10	.30	2.59*
ACTUALLY REAL											
SCRIPT	.03	.05	.07	.09	.10	.11	.04	.05	.06	.08	4.28**
R Objective	.18	.39	.15	.36	.35	.49			.17	.38	3.53*
Mother Died			.18	.39	.13	.34	.04	.21	.09	.29	2.69*
PRODUCTION	.14	.13	.15	.14	.12	.13	.12	.10	.14	.13	
IN CUES	.05	.10	.06	.08	.02	.04	.03	.05	.04	.08	
OUT KNOWLEDGE	.02	.06	.07	.10	.08	.10	.12	.09	.07	.09	6.48***
Th Context			.09	.29	.09	.29	.30	.47	.11	.31	4.93**
Gen Knowledge	.06	.24	.12	.33	.04	.21	.30	.47	.13	.33	3.31*
Soc Realism	.03	.17	.03	.17	.22	.42	.04	.21	.07	.26	3.28*
REALISTIC											
SCRIPT	.02	.05	.06	.06	.07	.08	.07	.10	.05	.07	
Whole Play	.03	.17	.03	.17			.26	.45	.07	.26	5.96***
PRODUCTION	.08	.09	.10	.08	.08	.10	.05	.06	.08	.09	
Live actors	.12	.33							.04	.19	3.50*
Sound/Lights	.06	.24	.21	.42			.09	.29	.10	.30	2.73*
IN CUES	.07	.10	.12	.12	.07	.08	.04	.08	.08	.10	3.44*
Visual	.12	.17	.19	.22	.11	.15	.05	.13	.13	.18	2.87*
OUT KNOWLEDGE	.05	.09	.08	.11	.08	.12	.11	.10	.08	.11	
Soc Realism	.03	.17	.06	.24	.26	.45	.26	.45	.13	.34	3.91**

*p <.05 **p <.01 ***p <.001 ****p <.0001

[Note: Categories in caps represent mean totals of all sub-categories added and divided by number of categories used to create new variable.]